

6.0 ALTERNATIVES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The identification and analysis of alternatives is a fundamental concept under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA requires the consideration of alternative development scenarios and an analysis of the potential impacts associated with those alternatives. Through comparison of these alternatives to the proposed project, the advantages of each can be weighed and analyzed. Section 15126.6(a) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) “describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.”

Additionally, Sections 15126.6 (e) and (f) of the *CEQA Guidelines* state:

- The specific alternative of “no project” shall also be evaluated along with its impact. If the environmentally superior alternative is the “no project” alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.
- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason” that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project. The range of feasible alternatives shall be selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making.

Pursuant to the *CEQA Guidelines* stated above, a range of alternatives to the proposed project is considered and evaluated in this EIR. The discussion in the section provides:

- A description of alternatives considered;
- An analysis of whether the alternatives meet most of the objectives of the project (described in Chapter 3.0 of this EIR); and
- A comparative analysis of the alternatives under consideration and the proposed project. The focus of this analysis is to determine if alternatives are capable of eliminating or reducing the significant environmental effects of the project to a less than significant level. Table 6-8 (located at the end of this chapter) provides a summary of this analysis.

6.2 CRITERIA FOR ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

In developing the alternatives to be addressed in this EIR, the potential alternatives were evaluated in terms of their ability to meet the basic objectives of the Master Plan, while reducing or avoiding the environmental impacts of the Master Plan identified in Section 4.0, Environmental Analysis, of the EIR. As discussed in Section 3.0, Project Description, project objectives are as follows:

- (1) Provide land uses that are compatible and complementary with the existing surrounding and adjacent land uses and facilities in an effort to sustain the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) “Smart Growth” principles for the Quarry Creek area. Establish sufficient land use intensity on the site to support the “Community Center” designation on the Smart Growth Concept Map.

- (2) Provide a high density and medium-high density community in compliance with the policies of the Housing Element of the Carlsbad General Plan.
- (3) Establish a comprehensive development plan for the site that provides an appropriate balance of open space, residential and public use land uses.
- (4) Develop a sustainable community by focusing the land use design parameters on environmental, cultural, social, and economic sustainability. Provide a plan that is strongly influenced by recognition of the balance between human interaction (development of urban uses) and natural systems (environmental conservation), in order to meet the needs of current and future generations, and to respect the history of past generations who have lived on the property.
- (5) Construct a community that preserves and protects the most important cultural heritage aspects of the property.
- (6) Provide a plan that permanently preserves the culturally-significant El Salto Falls and the full alignment of Buena Vista Creek through the Quarry Creek property, and includes a significant development buffer of native landscape protecting each of these natural and historic resources.
- (7) Comply with the Carlsbad Habitat Management Plan (HMP) and conserve open spaces through consistency with the requirements of the City of Carlsbad and Wildlife Agencies approved HMP. The Master Plan clusters proposed development only to a number of compact areas allowed for development as defined in the HMP. This will allow for wildlife corridors and sensitive vegetation communities to be conserved, mitigated, protected and managed in accordance with the standards required by these Agencies.
- (8) Provide replacement land uses for the rock quarry. Provide a modern, sustainable urban development in place of a highly-disturbed quarry site, which has been utilized for unattractive and landscape-scarring mining operations since 1961.
- (9) Implement a plan which is aesthetically pleasing, and compatible and complimentary to adjacent land uses and facilities.
- (10) Conserve open space areas for recreation and the preservation of sensitive environmental resources by clustering development within the non-environmentally sensitive areas of the property, as indicated by the approved HMP Hardline.
- (11) Implement the applicable portions of the City of Carlsbad General Plan and Zoning Code; and the Zone 25 Local Facilities Management Plan, as adopted by the concurrent application.
- (12) Provide an economically-viable development program for the property.
- (13) Design a community that encourages social interaction through providing for the recreational and open space needs of project residents and the City at large, by incorporating recreational land uses including public areas, recreation facilities, pocket parks, a pedestrian circulation system and substantial areas of permanently preserved natural open space.
- (14) Provide for a variety of housing choices in order to accommodate the housing needs of a range of economic levels and age groups, to promote social diversity, and to support an economically viable development program.
- (15) Add to the City's inventory of housing diversity by providing both market rate and affordable housing opportunities that are conveniently located adjacent to transportation, commercial, recreational and public uses.

- (16) Provide architectural and landscape Guidelines applicable to an approximate mix of housing types which meet the City's goals for establishing a sustainable community that is marketable within the evolving economic profile of the surrounding community and the City of Carlsbad as a whole.
- (17) Modify the City of Carlsbad Circulation Element to eliminate Marron Road and Rancho del Oro Road from extending through the Buena Vista Creek Ecological Reserve.
- (18) Ensure sufficient developable acreage in different residential densities to provide varied housing types for households in all economic segments.
- (19) Provide a plan that recognizes the development potential of the entire site as contemplated in the current adopted General Plan and Habitat Management Plan.
- (20) Obtain approval of a development plan with sufficient variety of product types to overcome the economic impact of the City of Carlsbad's infrastructure construction and public safety requirements, which severely constrain infrastructure phasing on the property.

6.3 ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED FROM DETAILED CONSIDERATION

In addition to specifying that the EIR evaluate "a range of reasonable alternatives" to the project, Section 15126.6(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR identify any alternatives that were considered but were rejected as infeasible.

6.3.1 Alternative Location

In certain cases, an evaluation of an alternative location in an EIR is necessary. Section 15126(f)(A) of the *CEQA Guidelines* states, "Key question. The key question and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR."

With respect to the proposed Quarry Creek project, constructing the proposed project at an alternative location could avoid some of the significant, environmental impacts associated with the proposed project; however, it is likely that development of the project at an alternative location would, in turn, result in additional environmental impacts. Furthermore, development of the proposed Master Plan project at an alternative location would require approximately 40-50 acres of vacant land with available supporting infrastructure.

There is no vacant land in the northeast quadrant of the City suitable in size, and that is not environmentally constrained or with appropriate access, to accommodate the proposed project residential units. Furthermore, other supporting facilities and uses (such as community facilities) would not be provided with this acreage amount as would be provided under the Master Plan. The West Village of Robertson Ranch has not yet been developed (the Robertson Ranch Master Plan was adopted by the City in 2006). The West Village includes areas of steep slopes and sensitive habitat, and a majority of the West Village is currently in agricultural production or fallow fields. All master planning for the entire West Village is completed, and development of the West Village will help the City meet its remaining regional housing needs allocation.

The City considers the alternative location infeasible and rejects further analysis of this alternative due to the fact that the West Village of Robertson Ranch is subject to the Robertson Ranch Master Plan and

associated General Plan land uses and zoning regulations, which have already been accounted for in the City's adopted Housing Element, and the potential dwelling units would contribute to meeting the City's Regional Housing Needs Allocation. In order to accommodate the proposed project, Robertson Ranch Master Plan Planning Areas (PA) 3, 7, and 8, and potentially a portion of PA 9 would need to be removed from the Master Plan land use configuration as currently adopted. Development of the proposed project at this location would in turn, eliminate the ability to develop these areas as intended under the adopted Robertson Ranch Master Plan, and which have been included in the 2005-2010 Housing Element. Development of the proposed project at this location would create the need for the development of additional units elsewhere in the northeast quadrant of the City in order to meet the City's regional housing needs allocation.

6.4 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

6.4.1 No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative

CEQA Guidelines require analysis of the No Project Alternative (Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 15126). According to Section 15126.6(e), "the specific alternative of 'no project' shall also be evaluated along with its impacts. The 'no project' analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published, at the time environmental analysis is commenced, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services."

6.4.1.1 Description of Alternative

The No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative assumes that the project site would be developed pursuant to the existing General Plan land use designations on the site. Under this alternative, development of the project site would be primarily either one large subdivision or a series of single-family residential subdivisions (low-medium density). The residential low-medium density (RLM) General Plan designation allows 0-4 dwelling units per acre. Pursuant to the City of Carlsbad General Plan and Zoning regulations, and allowed for residential density calculation credit per the existing General Plan Land Use Element, the maximum allowed residential units allowed on the Quarry Creek project site is 293 units, based on existing General Plan land use designations. Figure 6-1 provides the conceptual land use plan for the No Project/Existing General Plan alternative. Table 6-1 provides a statistical summary, with a more detailed summary provided on Figure 6-1.

Table 6-1. No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative Statistical Summary

Land Use Type	Acres	Dwelling Units
<i>Residential</i>		
Single Family	104.2	293
<i>Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>104.2</i>	<i>293</i>
<i>Non-Residential</i>		
Open Space	45.2	N/A
Public Roads	6.6	N/A

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

PA	LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN DENSITY RANGE	GROSS ACRES	NET ACRES	DENSITY	MAX. UNITS
RESIDENTIAL							
R-1	Planned Development	(RLM) Low-Medium Density	0-4 du/ac	31.3	22.0	4.0	88
R-2	Planned Development	(RLM) Low-Medium Density	0-4 du/ac	13.5	9.5	4.0	38
R-3	Planned Development	(RLM) Low-Medium Density	0-4 du/ac	59.4	41.8	4.0	167
RESIDENTIAL SUB-TOTALS				104.2	73.3	--	293
OPEN SPACE							
OS-1	Open Space	(OS) Open Space	--	21.2	--	--	--
OS-2	Open Space	(OS) Open Space	--	3.6	--	--	--
OS-3	Open Space	(OS) Open Space	--	20.4	--	--	--
OPEN SPACE SUB-TOTALS				45.2	--	--	--
Public Roads				6.6	6.6	--	--
PROJECT TOTALS				156.0	79.9	--	293

- Existing HMP Hardline
 New HMP Hardline per this Alternative



SOURCE:
City of Carlsbad - General Plan Land Use Map - January 2012.

No Project/Existing General Plan (293 Dwelling Units)

FIGURE 6-1

Marron Road would be extended through the project site in an east-west direction from College Boulevard westerly to its existing terminus approximately 1.3 miles to west. This alternative would comply with the City's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (City Municipal Code Chapter 21.85) by developing 15 percent of the total units as affordable to low income households. Under the Existing General Plan Alternative, the project would be obligated to provide a maximum of 44 dwelling units (293 dwelling units x 15%) as affordable to lower-income households.

As compared to the proposed project, the Existing General Plan Alternative would provide 293 low-medium density residential units, instead of 656 units of medium-high to high density residential units.

Aesthetics. Implementation of this alternative would not avoid the significant visual impact associated with the proposed project as it relates to modification of the view from the Marron-Hayes Adobe. As discussed in Section 5.1, the character-defining features of Marron-Hayes Adobe building include its historic setting and viewshed from the full-length recessed *corredor*, qualities that contribute to its NRHP and CRHR eligibility. The *corredor* functioned as primary circulation space as well as living space, and included a scenic view overlooking the Buena Vista Creek and open hillsides located to the south. Under this alternative, more of the Panhandle parcel would be developed with residential uses, creating a greater aesthetic impact than the proposed project. Additionally, this alternative would include the extension of Marron Road to connect to the west of the project site with its existing terminus east of El Camino Real, as well as the Rancho Del Oro connection to Marron Road. This extension would occur within areas currently proposed and/or designated for open space, which would result in a greater aesthetic impact to the viewshed as compared to the proposed project.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant agriculture and forestry resources impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Air Quality. This alternative would result in a greater short-term air quality impact as compared to the proposed project associated with daily construction activities. Because the overall area of disturbance would be greater than the proposed project, daily fugitive dust emissions during grading, heavy equipment usage would be greater. Daily emissions thresholds for Particulate matter of 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀) and particulate matter of 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM_{2.5}) would be greater. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures as outlined in Section 5.3 would be required in order to reduce the daily emissions to a level less than significant.

No significant air quality impacts associated with the operation of the proposed project have been identified. Therefore, this alternative would not avoid, or reduce, a significant operational air quality impact.

Biological Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a greater impact to biological resources than the proposed project. As compared to the proposed project, this alternative would expand the development footprint/limits of disturbance and reduce the total amount of open space by 42.7 acres (87.9 acres of open space proposed under the Master Plan, 45.2 acres under this alternative). This alternative would result in increased impacts to most sensitive vegetation communities on-site, including coastal sage scrub and wetland communities. The open space PA for Buena Vista Creek as it traverses through the site would be approximately 160 feet in width, which reduces the width of the Creek from bank-to-bank a minimum of 160 feet, and in some locations, by over 200 feet (the conservation easement over the creek as provided by the Reclamation Plan would presumably be maintained). This alternative would not expand the HMP Hardline as would occur under the proposed project. Rather, the alternative

would decrease, and in some areas, fragment the HMP Hardline, resulting in a less efficient preserve design. Furthermore, Marron Road and the Rancho Del Oro connection would be extended off-site further increasing biological impacts and traversing an HMP open space corridor.

Cultural Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a greater impact as compared to the proposed project with respect to cultural resources site SDI-5651, Locus 1, as the development footprint would impact this resource. Locus 1 is recommended eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and considered a cultural resource under CEQA and the City's cultural resource guidelines. It is highly probable that relatively undisturbed deposits remain at Locus 1. Locus 1 will be preserved in open space under the proposed project, but it would be impacted under this alternative.

Implementation of this alternative would also have a greater impact with respect to the potential to impact previously unearthed resources. Due to the history of the project site and the existence of known cultural resources sites within the project site boundaries and vicinity, it is very likely that previously unearthed resources may exist within the project site not previously studied. This alternative would have a larger development footprint/area of disturbance as the proposed project; therefore, the potential impact is considered greater than the project. As with the proposed project, damage to a previously unknown resource would be considered a significant impact and mitigation for this alternative would be required as outlined in Section 5.5.

The El Salto Falls has been identified by the San Luis Rey Band and the Luiseño tribe as a sacred site, used for tribal religious ceremonies and important in their cultural history. The development of a Falls Management Plan was a requirement of the City of Oceanside's Reclamation Plan approval, which was approved by the City of Oceanside in June 2010. The Falls Management Plan applies to the area within 200 feet of the El Salto Falls. Under this alternative, PA OS-1 would be narrower in width in the area of El Salto Falls, and the development buffer could be less than the project, subject to approval of the Final Falls Management Plan. As such, the impact to El Salto Falls would be greater than the proposed project.

As with the proposed project proposed, implementation of this alternative would result in potentially significant paleontological resource impacts in association with grading/excavation in previously undisturbed areas of the Quaternary terrace deposits (moderate sensitivity) and the Tertiary Santiago Formation (high sensitivity). The area of disturbance associated with this impact would be greater than the proposed project; therefore, the potential to encounter paleontological resources would be correspondingly larger. This alternative would require the implementation of mitigation measures associated with these potential impacts as identified in Section 5.5.

Geology and Soils. This alternative would result in a greater geology and soils impact as the proposed project. While the number of dwelling units would be less than the proposed project, the overall development footprint would be greater than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.6 Geology and Soils of this EIR would be required under this alternative.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant greenhouse gas emissions/global climate change impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impact as the proposed project. Grading activities under this alternative would include grading south of Haymar Drive and would result in the need for removal and disposal of 1,000 cubic yards of

petroleum contaminated soil. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials of this EIR would be required under this alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of this alternative would result in a greater potential for short-term water quality impacts associated with grading and construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Because the area of disturbance and grading would be greater than the proposed project, there would be a greater potential for sedimentation to occur to Buena Vista Creek during a rainfall event. Potential water quality impacts identified for the project are associated predominantly with short-term construction activities including grading, excavation, and construction of drainage facilities. Specifically, these potential impacts include erosion/sedimentation, discharge of construction-related hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, etc.), and erosion/sedimentation and/or contaminant discharge from the disposal of extracted groundwater (if required). As with the proposed project, implementation of construction best management practices (BMPs) (as outlined in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) during construction would reduce potential impacts to water quality to a level less than significant. Although no significant operational impacts have been identified associated with the proposed project, this alternative would result in a similar potential for pollutants to be generated from residential developments, streets, and parking lots. As with the proposed project, implementation of BMPs and other water quality treatment features would be required in order to ensure no long-term water quality impact would occur.

Land Use and Planning. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant land use and planning impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified. However, this alternative would not provide the quantity and diversity of residential units as stipulated in the City's current Housing Element, necessitating the construction of residential units elsewhere. This alternative would not be consistent with SANDAG regional smart growth plans.

Noise. This alternative would result in a similar noise impact as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the future noise levels are expected to be at or below 60 dBA CNEL and no noise mitigation would be required to comply with the City of Carlsbad Noise standards based on currently proposed uses. However, mitigation is proposed that would require a site specific noise study to be prepared for each residential Lot based upon the final site design (i.e., site plan for each residential project within the Master Plan), building orientation, and pad elevations to ensure compliance with the City's exterior noise thresholds.

In addition, the second level building facades are anticipated to be above 60 dBA CNEL at Lots 1 (PA R-1), 2 (PA R-2), 3 (PA R-3), and 4 (PD R-4). As with the proposed project, this alternative would require mitigation in the form of preparing a final interior noise assessment based on final building design (i.e., architectural and building plans), and to identify the interior noise requirements based upon architectural and building plans.

Population and Housing. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant population and housing impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Public Services. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with public services as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

Transportation and Traffic. This alternative would generate approximately 2,930 average daily trips (ADTs) which are 2,493 trips less than the proposed project. In order to avoid the significant, and

unmitigable, direct traffic impact associated with the proposed project, the ADTs would have to be approximately 1,960 or less for no direct impacts. Therefore, although fewer trips would be generated, this alternative would not reduce, or avoid the significant, unmitigable transportation, and traffic impact associated with the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would reduce the demand for water, sewer and other utilities, but would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with utilities and service systems as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified. As with the proposed project, implementation of this alternative would require the construction of off-site improvements.

6.4.1.2 Conclusion – No Project/Existing General Plan Alternative

This alternative is consistent with the existing RLM General Plan Land Use designation and would not require a General Plan Amendment to the Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element, and Circulation Element; however, this alternative is not consistent with the City's more recently adopted Housing Element policy for the project site. This alternative would result in greater impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and hydrology and water quality. The alternative would result in similar impacts to the remaining issue area as compared to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the following objectives of the project:

- (1) Provide land uses that are compatible and complementary with the existing surrounding and adjacent land uses and facilities in an effort to sustain the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) "Smart Growth" principles for the Quarry Creek area. Establish sufficient land use intensity on the site to support the "Community Center" designation on the Smart Growth Concept Map.
- (2) Provide a high density and medium-high density community in compliance with the policies of the Housing Element of the Carlsbad General Plan.
- (3) Establish a comprehensive development plan for the site that provides an appropriate balance of open space, residential and public use land uses.
- (4) Develop a sustainable community by focusing the land use design parameters on environmental, cultural, social, and economic sustainability. Provide a plan that is strongly influenced by recognition of the balance between human interaction (development of urban uses) and natural systems (environmental conservation), in order to meet the needs of current and future generations, and to respect the history of past generations who have lived on the property.
- (5) Construct a community that preserves and protects the most important cultural heritage aspects of the property.
- (6) Provide a plan that permanently preserves the culturally-significant El Salto Falls and the full alignment of Buena Vista Creek through the Quarry Creek property, and includes a significant development buffer of native landscape protecting each of these natural and historic resources.
- (7) Comply with the Carlsbad Habitat Management Plan (HMP) and conserve open spaces through consistency with the requirements of the City of Carlsbad and Wildlife Agencies approved HMP. The Master Plan clusters proposed development only to a number of compact areas allowed for development as defined in the HMP. This will allow for wildlife corridors and sensitive vegetation communities to be conserved, mitigated, protected and managed in accordance with the standards required by these Agencies.

- (9) Implement a plan which is aesthetically pleasing, and compatible and complimentary to adjacent land uses and facilities.
- (10) Conserve open space areas for recreation and the preservation of sensitive environmental resources by clustering development within the non-environmentally sensitive areas of the property, as indicated by the approved HMP Hardline.
- (13) Design a community that encourages social interaction through providing for the recreational and open space needs of project residents and the City at large, by incorporating recreational land uses including public areas, recreation facilities, pocket parks, a pedestrian circulation system and substantial areas of permanently preserved natural open space.
- (14) Provide for a variety of housing choices in order to accommodate the housing needs of a range of economic levels and age groups, to promote social diversity, and to support an economically viable development program.
- (15) Add to the City's inventory of housing diversity by providing both market rate and affordable housing opportunities that are conveniently located adjacent to transportation, commercial, recreational and public uses.
- (16) Provide architectural and landscape Guidelines applicable to an approximate mix of housing types which meet the City's goals for establishing a sustainable community that is marketable within the evolving economic profile of the surrounding community and the City of Carlsbad as a whole.
- (17) Modify the City of Carlsbad Circulation Element to eliminate Marron Road and Rancho del Oro Road from extending through the Buena Vista Creek Ecological Reserve.
- (18) Ensure sufficient developable acreage in different residential densities to provide varied housing types for households in all economic segments.

6.4.2 No Project/ No Development

The purpose of this alternative is to reduce impacts associated with development of the project site. This alternative avoids impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, grading, and water quality, transportation, geology and soils, noise, and cultural resources.

6.4.2.1 Description of Alternative

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the project site would not be developed and would remain vacant. This alternative also assumes that the Circulation Element roadways (Marron Road and Rancho Del Oro) would not be constructed.

Aesthetics. Implementation of this alternative would avoid the significant visual impact associated with the proposed project as it relates to modification of the view from the Marron-Hayes Adobe. As discussed in Section 5.1, the character-defining features of Marron-Hayes Adobe building include its historic setting and viewshed from the full-length recessed *corredor*, qualities that contribute to its NRHP and CRHR eligibility. The *corredor* functioned as primary circulation space as well as living space, and included a scenic view overlooking the Buena Vista Creek and open hillsides located to the south. Under this alternative, project site would not be developed, avoiding the aesthetic impact associated with the proposed project.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant agriculture and forestry resources impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Air Quality. This alternative would not result in a short-term air quality impact associated with the proposed project, as no construction or development would occur that would generate short-term construction emissions. This alternative would not result in the generation of criteria pollutant emissions, therefore, operational emissions would be less than the proposed project. However, impacts under the proposed project were found to be less than significant; therefore, this alternative would not avoid, or reduce, a significant operational air quality impact.

Biological Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not result in impacts to biological resources as no development would occur, therefore, existing sensitive resources would not be disturbed. Compared to the proposed project, impacts to biological resources would be avoided.

Cultural Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not result in impacts to cultural resources site SDI-5651, Locus 1. Locus 1 is recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR and considered a cultural resource under CEQA and the City's cultural resource guidelines. It is highly probable that relatively undisturbed deposits remain at Locus 1. Compared to the project, potential impacts to Locus 1 would be avoided.

Due to the history of the project site and the existence of known cultural resources sites within the project site boundaries and vicinity, it is very likely that previously unearthed resources may exist within the project site not previously studied. Implementation of this alternative would avoid the potential impact associated with unearthing previously unknown cultural resources.

The El Salto Falls has been identified by the San Luis Rey Band and the Luiseño tribe as a sacred site, used for tribal religious ceremonies and important in their cultural history. The development of a Falls Management Plan was a requirement of the City of Oceanside's Reclamation Plan approval, which was approved by the City of Oceanside in June 2010. The Falls Management Plan applies to the area within 200 feet of the El Salto Falls. Under this alternative, the project site would not be developed. No impact to El Salto Falls has been identified associated with the proposed project; therefore, this alternative would not avoid, or reduce, a significant impact to the Falls.

Implementation of this alternative would not result in potentially significant impacts to paleontological resource, as no construction and development would occur. Compared to the project, impacts paleontological resources would be avoided.

Geology and Soils. This alternative would not result in geology and soils impact as no construction or development would occur. Compared to the project, impacts would be avoided.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Under this alternative, no greenhouse gas emissions would occur. Impacts would be less under this alternative since no emissions would occur; however, implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant greenhouse gas emissions/global climate change impact associated with the proposed project as no significant project impact has been identified.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the hazards and hazardous materials impact associated with removal of 1,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil,

as the grading activities would not occur. Therefore, compared to the project, the impact would be avoided.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of this alternative would avoid the potential for short-term water quality impacts since no grading and construction activities would occur. This alternative would also avoid any potential operational impacts generated from residential developments, streets, and parking lots. This alternative would avoid the potentially significant impacts to hydrology and water quality as compared to the proposed project.

Land Use and Planning. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant land use and planning impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified; however, this alternative would not accomplish General Plan Housing Element policies.

Noise. This alternative would avoid the noise impact associated with the proposed project as no new residential development would be introduced to the project site.

Population and Housing. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant population and housing impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Public Services. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with public services as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

Transportation and Traffic. This alternative would avoid the significant, and unmitigable, direct traffic impact associated with the proposed project as this alternative would not generate additional daily trips (ADTs) within the project area and vicinity.

Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with utilities and service systems as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

6.4.2.2 Conclusion – No Project/No Development Alternative

Under this alternative, impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, noise, and traffic would be avoided. This alternative would result in similar impacts to the remaining issue area as compared to the proposed project, as no significant impacts were identified under the proposed project. This alternative would not meet any of the basic objectives of the proposed project.

6.4.3 Reduced Development Footprint Alternative

The purpose of this alternative is to reduce impacts associated with development of the Panhandle parcel of the project site. This includes, but is not limited to, aesthetics, biological resources, and cultural resources.

6.4.3.1 Description of Alternative

The Reduced Development Footprint Alternative would provide a total of 656 residential dwelling units consisting of 456 High Density and 200 Medium High Density units. The development footprint, as it

extends westerly on the Panhandle parcel would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Figure 6-2 provides the conceptual land use plan for the Reduced Development Footprint alternative. Table 6-2 provides a statistical summary of this alternative, with a more detailed summary provided on Figure 6-2.

Table 6-2. Reduced Development Footprint Alternative Statistical Summary

Land Use Type	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units
<i>Residential</i>		
Multi Family – High Density	24.9	456
Multi Family – Medium High Density	18.4	200
<i>Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>43.3</i>	<i>656</i>
<i>Non-Residential</i>		
Open Space	93.5	N/A
Public Use	8.2	N/A
Public Roads	11.0	N/A
<i>Non-Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>112.7</i>	

Aesthetics. Implementation of this alternative would avoid the significant visual impact associated with the proposed project as it relates to modification of the view from the Marron-Hayes Adobe. As discussed in Section 5.1, the character-defining features of Marron-Hayes Adobe building include its historic setting and viewshed from the full-length recessed *corredor*, qualities that contribute to its NRHP and CRHR eligibility. The *corredor* functioned as a primary circulation space as well as living space, and included a scenic view overlooking the Buena Vista Creek and open hillsides located to the south. Under this alternative, the development footprint on the Panhandle parcel would be pulled back, which would avoid the aesthetic impact associated with the proposed project.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant agriculture and forestry resources impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Air Quality. This alternative would proportionately reduce the short-term air quality impact associated with daily construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Because the overall area of disturbance would be less than the proposed project, daily fugitive dust emissions during grading, heavy equipment use, and from construction workers commuting to and from the project site would be less.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

PA	LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN DENSITY RANGE	GROSS ACRES	NET ACRES	DENSITY	MAX. UNITS
RESIDENTIAL							
R-1	Apartments *	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	7.1	5.9	22.2	131
R-2	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	11.1	9.4	22.5	211
R-3	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	6.7	5.7	20.0	114
R-4	Planned Development	(RMH) Medium-High Density	8-15 du/ac	18.4	15.6	12.8	200
RESIDENTIAL SUB-TOTALS				43.3	36.7	--	656
PUBLIC USE							
P-1	Community Facilities	(CF) Community Facility	--	0.9	0.9	--	--
P-2	Community Facility Site	(CF) Community Facility	--	2.1	1.2	--	--
P-3	Community Recreation Area	(OS) Open Space	--	1.3	1.1	--	--
P-4	Trail, View Area, Water Quality Basin	(OS) Open Space	--	3.3	3.3	--	--
P-5	Trailhead & Water Quality Basin	(OS) Open Space	--	0.6	0.6	--	--
PUBLIC USE SUB-TOTALS				8.2	7.1	--	--
OPEN SPACE							
OS-1	Southerly Open Space Corridor Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	65.0	--	--	--
OS-2	Wetland Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	20.1	--	--	--
OS-3	Buena Vista Creek and Buffer	(OS) Open Space	--	8.4	--	--	--
OPEN SPACE SUB-TOTALS				93.5	--	--	--
Public Roads				--	--	--	--
PROJECT TOTALS				156.0	54.8	--	656

* Includes affordable and potential market rate units.

- Existing HMP Hardline
- New HMP Hardline per this Alternative
- Brush Management per HMP Hardline Map

NOTE: Units can be transferred subject to total project unit maximum.



Reduced Development Footprint FIGURE 6-2

Development of a smaller area would also reduce the required construction vehicle fleet mix; therefore, daily emissions thresholds for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} would be less. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures as outlined in Section 5.3 would be required in order to reduce the daily emissions to a level less than significant.

No significant air quality impacts associated with the operation of the proposed project have been identified. Therefore, this alternative would not avoid, or reduce, a significant operational air quality impact.

Biological Resources. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the biological impacts associated with the proposed project. As compared to the proposed project, this alternative would reduce the development footprint/limits of disturbance on the Panhandle parcel, and increase the total amount of open space by 6.2 acres (87.9 acres of open space proposed under the Master Plan, 94.1 acres under this alternative). This alternative would result in decreased impacts primarily to non-native grassland and smaller pockets of coastal sage scrub. The open space PA for Buena Vista Creek as it traverses through the site would be the same as the proposed project. This alternative would expand the HMP Hardline (i.e., increase the open space) on the Panhandle parcel increasing connectivity with other open space areas.

Cultural Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar impact as the proposed project to cultural resources site SDI-5651, Locus 1. Locus 1 is recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR and considered a cultural resource under CEQA and the City's cultural resource guidelines. It is highly probable that relatively undisturbed deposits remain at Locus 1. Locus 1 will be preserved in open space under the proposed project, and it can be assumed that Locus 1 would also be preserved under this alternative. However, as with the proposed project, construction and maintenance activities associated with supporting utilities for the project could inadvertently impact this resource, if not properly shielded and mitigation is required as outlined in Section 5.5.

Implementation of this alternative would reduce the potential impact with respect to the potential to impact previously unearthed resources. Because this alternative would have a reduced development footprint/area of disturbance as compared to the proposed project; there would be a reduced potential for project grading activities to encountered previously unearthed cultural resources. However, mitigation that addresses the potential for encountering buried resources would be similar for this alternative as the proposed project, as outlined in Section 5.5.

Under this alternative, PA OS-1 would be the same size as the proposed project in the area of El Salto Falls.

This alternative would correspondingly reduce the potentially significant paleontological resource impacts associated with grading/excavation in previously undisturbed areas of the Quaternary terrace deposits (moderate sensitivity) and the Tertiary Santiago Formation (high sensitivity) as a result of a reduced development footprint. As with the project, this alternative would require the implementation of mitigation measures associated with these potential impacts as identified in Section 5.5.

Geology and Soils. This alternative would correspondingly reduce the level of disturbance on the project site, resulting in a reduced geology and soils impact as compared to the proposed project. While the number of dwelling units would be the same as the proposed project, the overall development footprint would be reduced as compared to the project, therefore, less grading and soils disturbance would occur.

As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.6 Geology and Soils of this EIR would be required under this alternative.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant greenhouse gas emissions/global climate change impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impact as the proposed project. Grading activities under this alternative would include grading south of Haymar Drive and would result in the need for removal and disposal of 1,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials of this EIR would be required under this alternative..

Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the potential short-term water quality impacts associated with grading and construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Because there would be less disturbance and overall grading under this alternative, there would be correspondingly less potential for sedimentation to occur to Buena Vista Creek during a rainfall event. Potential water quality impacts identified for the project are associated predominantly with short-term construction activities including grading, excavation, and construction of drainage facilities. Specifically, these potential impacts include erosion/sedimentation, discharge of construction-related hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, etc.), and erosion/sedimentation and/or contaminant discharge from the disposal of extracted groundwater (if required). As with the proposed project, implementation of construction BMPs (as outlined in the SWPPP) during construction would reduce potential impacts to water quality to a level less than significant. Although no significant operational impacts have been identified associated with the proposed project, this alternative would reduce the potential for pollutants to be generated from residential developments, streets, and parking lots.

Land Use and Planning. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant land use and planning impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Noise. This alternative would result in a similar noise impact as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the future noise levels are expected to be at or below 60 dBA CNEL and no noise mitigation would be required to comply with the City of Carlsbad Noise standards based on currently proposed uses. However, mitigation is proposed that would require a site specific noise study to be prepared for each residential Lot based upon the final site design (i.e., site plan for each residential project within the Master Plan), building orientation, and pad elevations to ensure compliance with the City's exterior noise thresholds.

In addition, the second level building facades are anticipated to be above 60 dBA CNEL at Lots 1 (PA R-1), 2 (PA R-2), 3 (PA R-3), and 4 (PD R-4). As with the proposed project, this alternative would require mitigation in the form of preparing a final interior noise assessment based on final building design (i.e., architectural and building plans), and to identify the interior noise requirements based upon architectural and building plans.

Population and Housing. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant population and housing impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Public Services. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with public services as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

Transportation and Traffic. This alternative would generate the same number of vehicular trips as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would not reduce, or avoid the significant, unmitigable transportation and traffic impact associated with the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with utilities and service systems as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

6.4.3.2 Conclusion – Reduced Development Footprint Alternative

Under this alternative, impacts to aesthetics with regard to altering the viewshed from the Marron Adobe would be avoided, and impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and hydrology and water quality would be reduced as the development footprint would be reduced. This alternative would result in similar impacts to noise and transportation/traffic as compared to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the following objectives of the proposed project:

- (18) Ensure sufficient developable acreage in different residential densities to provide varied housing types for households in all economic segments.
- (19) Provide a plan that recognizes the development potential of the entire site as contemplated in the current adopted General Plan and Habitat Management Plan.
- (20) Obtain approval of a development plan with sufficient variety of product types to overcome the economic impact of the City of Carlsbad's infrastructure construction and public safety requirements, which severely constrain infrastructure phasing on the property.

6.4.4 Existing HMP Hardline and Circulation Element Alternative

The purpose of this alternative is to evaluate a land use plan that would not involve proposed amendments to the City's existing HMP Hardline preserve and the General Plan Circulation Element. As discussed in Section 3.0, implementation of the proposed project will involve a General Plan amendment to the City's Circulation Element to eliminate the planned westward extension of Marron Road, which is designated as a four-lane Secondary Arterial road, and is currently depicted in the Circulation Element as a connection between College Boulevard and El Camino Real. (Under the proposed project, the classification of Marron Road would also be changed within the Master Plan area to a Controlled Collector roadway.) Under the proposed project, the General Plan Amendment would also eliminate the Rancho del Oro Road extension from the Circulation Element. Also, the project proposes minor changes to the HMP Hardline Preserve, which in turn will require an amendment to the City's Open Space and Conservation Element. Under this alternative, the existing HMP Hardline would remain in its current configuration.

6.4.4.1 Description of Alternative

The Existing HMP Hardline and Circulation Element Alternative would provide a total of 788 residential dwelling units consisting of 331 High Density and 457 Medium High Density units. Under the existing HMP Hardline, the development footprint would be larger than the proposed project. Additionally, the area of disturbance would be expanded as compared to the proposed project in order to accommodate the Marron Road alignment completely through the project site and accounting for the likely alignment of the

roadway off-site. Figure 6-3 provides the conceptual land use plan for the Existing HMP Hardline and Circulation Element alternative. Table 6-3 provides a statistical summary of this alternative's land use plan, with a more detailed summary provided on Figure 6-3.

Table 6-3. Existing HMP Hardline and Circulation Element Alternative Statistical Summary

Land Use Type	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units
<i>Residential</i>		
Multi Family – High Density	20.0	331
Multi Family – Medium High Density	37.9	457
<i>Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>57.9</i>	<i>788</i>
<i>Non-Residential</i>		
Open Space	76.6	N/A
Public Use	6.3	N/A
Public Roads	15.2	N/A
<i>Non-Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>98.1</i>	

Aesthetics. Implementation of this alternative would not avoid the significant visual impact associated with the proposed project as it relates to modification of the view from the Marron-Hayes Adobe. Under this alternative, the development footprint on the Panhandle parcel would be greater than the proposed project. Additionally, Marron Road would be extended off-site to connect with its existing terminus immediately east of El Camino Real, and Rancho Del Oro would be extended to connect with Marron Road. Therefore, the aesthetic impact would be greater than the proposed project.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant agriculture and forestry resources impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Air Quality. This alternative would result in a greater short-term air quality impact to the proposed project associated with daily construction activities. Because the overall area of disturbance would be greater than the proposed project, daily fugitive dust emissions during grading, heavy equipment usage, and from construction workers commuting to and from the project site would be greater. Mitigation measures as outlined in Section 5.3 would be required in order to reduce the daily emissions to a level less than significant.

No significant air quality impacts associated with the operation of the proposed project have been identified. Therefore, this alternative would not avoid, or reduce, a significant operational air quality impact.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY							
PA	LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN DENSITY RANGE	GROSS ACRES	NET ACRES	DENSITY	MAX. UNITS
RESIDENTIAL							
R-1	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	6.9	6.0	21.4	129
R-2A	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	11.2	9.1	20.0	182
R-2B	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	1.9	1.0	20.0	20
R-3	Planned Development	(RMH) Medium-High Density	8-15 du/ac	7.0	5.7	14.5	82
R-4	Planned Development	(RMH) Medium-High Density	8-15 du/ac	10.2	9.5	14.2	135
R-5	Planned Development	(RMH) Medium-High Density	8-15 du/ac	11.7	10.6	13.8	146
R-6	Planned Development	(RMH) Medium-High Density	8-15 du/ac	9.0	7.0	13.4	94
RESIDENTIAL SUB-TOTALS				57.9	48.9	--	788
PUBLIC USE							
P-1	Community Facilities	(CF) Community Facility	--	0.9	0.9	--	--
P-2	Community Facility Site	(CF) Community Facility	--	1.3	1.3	--	--
P-3	Community Recreation Area	(OS) Open Space	--	1.3	1.1	--	--
P-4	Trail, View Area, Water Quality Basin	(OS) Open Space	--	2.8	2.8	--	--
PUBLIC USE SUB-TOTALS				6.3	6.1	--	--
OPEN SPACE							
OS-1	Southerly Open Space Corridor Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	49.4	--	--	--
OS-2	Wetland Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	18.2	--	--	--
OS-3	Buena Vista Creek and Buffer	(OS) Open Space	--	7.6	--	--	--
OS-4	Panhandle Northern Open Space Area	(OS) Open Space	--	1.4	--	--	--
OPEN SPACE SUB-TOTALS				76.6	--	--	--
Public Roads				15.2	15.2	--	--
PROJECT TOTALS				156.0	70.2	--	788

--- Limits of Existing Hardline Map Boundary



Existing HMP Hardline and Circulation Element
FIGURE 6-3

Biological Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a greater impact to biological resources as compared to the proposed project. This alternative would expand the development footprint/limits of disturbance and reduce the total amount of open space by 11.3 acres (87.9 acres of open space proposed under the Master Plan, 76.6 acres under this alternative). This alternative would result in increased impacts to most sensitive vegetation communities on-site, including coastal sage scrub and wetland communities due to the increased development footprint on the Panhandle parcel. The increased development footprint/area of disturbance would be needed to accommodate the extension of Marron Road through the project site in such a way so as to connect with the alignment off-site area west of the project site. The open space PA for Buena Vista Creek as it traverses through the site would be the same as the proposed project. This alternative would not expand the HMP Hardline as would occur under the proposed project. Rather, the alternative would decrease, and in some areas, fragment the HMP Hardline.

This alternative would allow for the connection of Marron Road through the project site, westerly, connecting with its existing terminus east of El Camino Real, and the extension of Rancho Del Oro. The construction of these Circulation Element roadways, would bisect HMP Hardline and dedicated open space areas and result in additional impacts to sensitive upland areas that would not occur under the proposed project.

Cultural Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar impact as the proposed project to cultural resources site SDI-5651, Locus 1. Locus 1 is recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR and considered a cultural resource under CEQA and the City's cultural resource guidelines. It is highly probable that relatively undisturbed deposits remain at Locus 1. Locus 1 will be preserved in open space under the proposed project, and it can be assumed that Locus 1 would also be preserved under this alternative due to the sensitivity of the archaeological site. However, as with the proposed project, construction and maintenance activities associated with supporting utilities for the project could inadvertently impact this resource, if not properly shielded and mitigation is required as outlined in Section 5.5.

Implementation of this alternative would have a greater impact with respect to the potential to impact previously unearthed resources due to the expanded development footprint and the additional grading and disturbance that would be required in order to construct the Marron Road and Rancho Del Oro connection off-site. Due to the history of the project site and the existence of known cultural resources sites within the project site boundaries and vicinity, it is very likely that previously unearthed resources may exist within the project site not previously studied. This alternative would have a greater development footprint/area of disturbance than the proposed project; therefore, the potential impact with respect to this issue is considered greater than the project. As with the proposed project, damage to a previously unknown resource would be considered a significant impact and mitigation for this alternative would be required as outlined in Section 5.5.

The El Salto Falls has been identified by the San Luis Rey Band and the Luiseño tribe as a sacred site, used for tribal religious ceremonies and important in their cultural history. The development of a Falls Management Plan was a requirement of the City of Oceanside's Reclamation Plan approval, which was approved by the City of Oceanside in June 2010. The Falls Management Plan applies to the area within 200 feet of the El Salto Falls. Under this alternative, PA OS-1 would be the same size as the proposed project in the area of El Salto Falls.

As with the proposed project, implementation of this alternative would result in potentially significant paleontological resource impacts in association with grading/excavation in previously undisturbed areas

of the Quaternary terrace deposits (moderate sensitivity) and the Tertiary Santiago Formation (high sensitivity). However, the area of disturbance associated with this impact would be greater than the proposed project; therefore, the potential to encounter paleontological resources would be greater. This alternative would require the implementation of mitigation measures associated with these potential impacts as identified in Section 5.5.

Geology and Soils. This alternative would result in a greater geology and soils impact as compared to the proposed project. The number of dwelling units would be greater than the proposed project and the overall development footprint would be greater, including the construction of Marron Road off-site. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.6 Geology and Soils of this EIR would be required under this alternative.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant greenhouse gas emissions/global climate change impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impact as the proposed project. Grading activities under this alternative would include grading south of Haymar Drive and would result in the need for removal and disposal of 1,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials of this EIR would be required under this alternative.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of this alternative would result in greater potential short-term water quality impacts associated with grading and construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Because the area of disturbance and grading would be greater than the proposed project, there would be a greater potential for sedimentation to occur to Buena Vista Creek during a rainfall event. This includes the construction of Marron Road off-site, through the valley to connect with its existing terminus east of El Camino Real. Potential water quality impacts identified for the project are associated predominantly with short-term construction activities including grading, excavation, and construction of drainage facilities. Specifically, these potential impacts include erosion/sedimentation, discharge of construction-related hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, etc.), and erosion/sedimentation and/or contaminant discharge from the disposal of extracted groundwater (if required). As with the proposed project, implementation of construction BMPs (as outlined in the SWPPP) during construction would reduce potential impacts to water quality to a level less than significant. Although no significant operational impacts have been identified associated with the proposed project, this alternative would result in a greater potential for pollutants to be generated from residential developments, streets, and parking lots. As with the proposed project, implementation of BMPs and other water quality treatment features would be required in order to ensure no long-term water quality impact would occur.

Land Use and Planning. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant land use and planning impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified. This alternative would provide more affordable housing units than the proposed project. Also, this alternative would not involve a General Plan Amendment to the City's Circulation Element related to the deletion of the Marron Road and Rancho Del Oro connections. This alternative would also not require an amendment to General Plan Open Space and Conservation Element, as the HMP Hardline would not be modified (increased) as is proposed under the proposed project.

Noise. This alternative would result in a similar noise impact as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the future noise levels are expected to be at or below 60 dBA CNEL and no noise mitigation would be required to comply with the City of Carlsbad Noise standards based on currently

proposed uses. However, mitigation is proposed that would require a site specific noise study to be prepared for each residential Lot based upon the final site design (i.e., site plan for each residential project within the Master Plan), building orientation, and pad elevations to ensure compliance with the City's exterior noise thresholds.

In addition, the second level building facades are anticipated to be above 60 dBA CNEL at Lots 1 (PA R-1), 2 (PA R-2), 3 (PA R-3), and 4 (PD R-4). As with the proposed project, this alternative would require mitigation in the form of preparing a final interior noise assessment based on final building design (i.e., architectural and building plans), and to identify the interior noise requirements based upon architectural and building plans.

The extension of Marron Road would introduce additional traffic noise in the area where none would occur under the proposed project.

Population and Housing. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant population and housing impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Public Services. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with public services as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

Transportation and Traffic. This alternative would generate a greater amount of vehicular trips as the proposed project. Therefore, this alternative would not reduce, or avoid the significant, unmitigable transportation and traffic impact associated with the proposed project. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 5.14 under roadway network Alternative 1, which assumes the extension of Marron Road from the existing east end at the Quarry Creek Plaza shopping center property line, to the existing west end approximately 1,000 feet west of El Camino Real, there would be no significant traffic impact associated with the deletion of this connection. Therefore, this alternative would not reduce the significant traffic impact associated with the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with utilities and service systems as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

6.4.4.2 Conclusion – Existing HMP Hardline and Circulation Element Alternative

This alternative would not reduce or avoid any of the significant impacts associated with the proposed project. This alternative would result in greater impacts to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and hydrology and water quality. The remaining issue areas would be similar to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the following objective of the project:

- (5) Construct a community that preserves and protects the most important cultural heritage aspects of the property.
- (17) Modify the City of Carlsbad Circulation Element to eliminate Marron Road and Rancho del Oro Road from extending through the Buena Vista Creek Ecological Reserve.

6.4.5 Special Use Area for Planning Area R-5

The purpose of this alternative is to evaluate an alternative land use plan that would provide a special use park in the northwestern portion of the Panhandle parcel. Under the proposed project, 56 Medium High Density residential units would be located in this area (Master Plan PA R-5). This alternative would potentially reduce or avoid the significant visual impact associated with the view from the Marron Adobe.

6.4.5.1 Description of Alternative

The Special Use Area for PA R-5 Alternative would provide a total of 656 residential dwelling units consisting of 456 High Density and 200 Medium High Density units. A 5.3 gross acre special use park would be provided in Master Plan PA R-5, the residential units within R-5 would be reallocated into PA R-4. Figure 6-4 provides the conceptual land use plan for the Special Use Area for PA R-5 alternative. Table 6-4 provides a statistical summary of this alternative land use plan, with a more detailed summary provided on Figure 6-4.

Table 6-4. Special Use Area for Planning Area R-5 Alternative Statistical Summary

Land Use Type	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units
<i>Residential</i>		
Multi Family – High Density	24.9	456
Multi Family – Medium High Density	18.4	200
<i>Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>43.3</i>	<i>656</i>
<i>Non-Residential</i>		
Open Space	88.2	N/A
Public Use	13.5	N/A
Public Roads	11.0	N/A
<i>Non-Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>112.7</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Aesthetics. Implementation of this alternative would avoid the significant visual impact associated with the proposed project as it relates to modification of the view from the Marron-Hayes Adobe. As discussed in Section 5.1, the character-defining features of Marron-Hayes Adobe building include its historic setting and viewshed from the full-length recessed *corredor*, qualities that contribute to its NRHP and CRHR eligibility. The *corredor* functioned as primary circulation space as well as living space, and included a scenic view overlooking the Buena Vista Creek and open hillsides located to the south. Under this alternative, the development footprint on the Panhandle parcel would be pulled back, and park uses would occur in the western most portion of the Panhandle parcel. This type of use would be more compatible with the *corredor*, and the aesthetic impact would be avoided.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant agriculture and forestry resources impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Air Quality. This alternative would result in a similar short-term air quality impact to the proposed project associated with daily construction activities. Because the overall area of disturbance would be similar to the proposed project, daily fugitive dust emissions during grading, heavy equipment usage, and from construction workers commuting to and from the project site, would be similar. Also, it is expected

that the construction vehicle fleet mix would be similar to that utilized for project construction; therefore, daily emissions thresholds for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} would be similar. Mitigation measures as outlined in Section 5.3 would be required in order to reduce the daily emissions to a level less than significant.

No significant air quality impacts associated with the operation of the proposed project have been identified. Therefore, this alternative would not avoid, or reduce, a significant operational air quality impact.

Biological Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar impact to biological resources as compared to the proposed project. Under this alternative, the development footprint/limits of disturbance would be similar, with a small increase (0.3 acre) in the amount of open space (87.9 acres of open space proposed under the Master Plan, 88.2 acres under this alternative). Because a special use park would occur in pa R-5 (shown as planning area P-6 on Figure 6-5) brush management/fuel modification zones would not be required at that location. The open space planning area for Buena Vista Creek as it traverses through the site would be the same as the proposed project. Under this alternative the HMP Hardline would be slightly increased on the Panhandle parcel.

Cultural Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar impact as the proposed project to cultural resources site SDI-5651, Locus 1. Locus 1 is recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR and considered a cultural resource under CEQA and the City's cultural resource guidelines. It is highly probable that relatively undisturbed deposits remain at Locus 1. Locus 1 will be preserved in open space under the proposed project, and it can be assumed that Locus 1 would also be preserved under this alternative. However, as with the proposed project, construction and maintenance activities associated with supporting utilities for the project could inadvertently impact this resource, if not properly shielded and mitigation is required as outlined in Section 5.5.

Implementation of this alternative would also have a similar impact with respect to the potential to impact previously unearthed resources. Due to the history of the project site and the existence of known cultural resources sites within the project site boundaries and vicinity, it is very likely that previously unearthed resources may exist within the project site not previously studied. This alternative would have a similar development footprint/area of disturbance as the proposed project; therefore, the potential impact is considered similar to the project. As with the proposed project, damage to a previously unknown resource would be considered a significant impact and mitigation for this alternative would be required as outlined in Section 5.5.

The El Salto Falls has been identified by the San Luis Rey Band and the Luiseño tribe as a sacred site, used for tribal religious ceremonies and important in their cultural history. The development of a Falls Management Plan was a requirement of the City of Oceanside's Reclamation Plan approval, which was approved by the City of Oceanside in June 2010. The Falls Management Plan applies to the area within 200 feet of the El Salto Falls. Under this alternative, PA OS-1 would be the same size as the proposed project in the area of El Salto Falls.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

PA	LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN DENSITY RANGE	GROSS ACRES	NET ACRES	DENSITY	MAX. UNITS
RESIDENTIAL							
R-1	Apartments *	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	7.1	5.9	22.2	131
R-2	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	11.1	9.4	22.5	211
R-3	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	6.7	5.7	20.0	114
R-4	Planned Development	(RMH) Medium-High Density	8-15 du/ac	18.4	15.6	12.8	200
RESIDENTIAL SUB-TOTALS				43.3	36.7	--	656
PUBLIC USE							
P-1	Community Facilities	(CF) Community Facility	--	0.9	0.9	--	--
P-2	Community Facility Site	(CF) Community Facility	--	2.1	1.2	--	--
P-3	Community Recreation Area	(OS) Open Space	--	1.3	1.1	--	--
P-4	Trail, View Area, Water Quality Basin	(OS) Open Space	--	3.3	3.3	--	--
P-5	Community Facilities	(CF) Community Facility	--	0.6	0.6	--	--
P-6	Special Use Park	(OS) Open Space	--	5.3	5.3	--	--
PUBLIC USE SUB-TOTALS				13.5	12.4	--	--
OPEN SPACE							
OS-1	Southerly Open Space Corridor Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	58.2	--	--	--
OS-2	Wetland Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	20.1	--	--	--
OS-3	Buena Vista Creek and Buffer	(OS) Open Space	--	8.4	--	--	--
OS-4	R-5 Northern Brush Management Zone	(OS) Open Space	--	1.5	--	--	--
OPEN SPACE SUB-TOTALS				88.2	--	--	--
Public Roads				--	--	--	--
PROJECT TOTALS				156.0	60.1	--	656

* Includes affordable and potential market rate units.

- Existing HMP Hardline
- New HMP Hardline per this Alternative
- Brush Management per HMP Hardline Map

NOTE: Units can be transferred subject to total project unit maximum.



Special Use Area for Planning Area R-5 FIGURE 6-4

As with the proposed project proposed, implementation of this alternative would result in potentially significant paleontological resource impacts in association with grading/excavation in previously undisturbed areas of the Quaternary terrace deposits (moderate sensitivity) and the Tertiary Santiago Formation (high sensitivity). The area of disturbance associated with this impact would be similar to the proposed project, therefore, the potential to encounter paleontological resources would be similar. This alternative would require the implementation of mitigation measures associated with these potential impacts as identified in Section 5.5.

Geology and Soils. This alternative would result in a similar geology and soils impact as the proposed project. The overall development footprint would be similar to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.6 Geology and Soils of this EIR would be required under this alternative.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant greenhouse gas emissions/global climate change impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impact as the proposed project. Grading activities under this alternative would include grading south of Haymar Drive and would result in the need for removal and disposal of 1,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials of this EIR would be required under this alternative. .

Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of this alternative would result in similar potential short-term water quality impacts associated with grading and construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Because the area of disturbance and grading would be similar to the proposed project, there would be a similar potential for sedimentation to occur to Buena Vista Creek during a rainfall event. Potential water quality impacts identified for the project are associated predominantly with short-term construction activities including grading, excavation, and construction of drainage facilities. Specifically, these potential impacts include erosion/sedimentation, discharge of construction-related hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, etc.), and erosion/sedimentation and/or contaminant discharge from the disposal of extracted groundwater (if required). As with the proposed project, implementation of construction BMPs (as outlined in the SWPPP) during construction would reduce potential impacts to water quality to a level less than significant. Although no significant operational impacts have been identified associated with the proposed project, this alternative would result in a similar potential for pollutants to be generated from residential developments, streets, and parking lots. As with the proposed project, implementation of BMPs and other water quality treatment features would be required in order to ensure no long-term water quality impact would occur.

Land Use and Planning. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant land use and planning impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Noise. This alternative would result in a similar noise impact as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the future noise levels are expected to be at or below 60 dBA CNEL and no noise mitigation would be required to comply with the City of Carlsbad Noise standards based on currently proposed uses. However, mitigation is proposed that would require a site specific noise study to be prepared for each residential Lot based upon the final site design (i.e., site plan for each residential project

within the Master Plan), building orientation, and pad elevations to ensure compliance with the City's exterior noise thresholds.

In addition, the second level building facades are anticipated to be above 60 dBA CNEL at Lots 1 (PA R-1), 2 (PA R-2), 3 (PA R-3), and 4 (PD R-4). As with the proposed project, this alternative would require mitigation in the form of preparing a final interior noise assessment based on final building design (i.e., architectural and building plans), and to identify the interior noise requirements based upon architectural and building plans.

Population and Housing. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant population and housing impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Public Services. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with public services as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

Transportation and Traffic. This alternative would result in a similar transportation and traffic impact as the proposed project as the ADTs generated by this alternative would be the same as the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with utilities and service systems as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

6.4.5.2 Conclusion – Special Use Area for Planning Area R-5 Alternative

Under this alternative, impacts to aesthetics with regard to altering the viewshed from the Marron Adobe would be avoided, and impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and hydrology and water quality would be reduced as the development footprint would be reduced. This alternative would result in similar impacts to noise and transportation/traffic as compared to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the following objectives of the proposed project:

- (18) Ensure sufficient developable acreage in different residential densities to provide varied housing types for households in all economic segments.
- (19) Provide a plan that recognizes the development potential of the entire site as contemplated in the current adopted General Plan and Habitat Management Plan.
- (20) Obtain approval of a development plan with sufficient variety of product types to overcome the economic impact of the City of Carlsbad's infrastructure construction and public safety requirements, which severely constrain infrastructure phasing on the property.

6.4.6 No Development on Panhandle Parcel – 656 Units

The purpose of this alternative is to reduce and/or avoid environmental impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, grading, and water quality, and cultural resources, by eliminating proposed development from the Panhandle parcel, and concentrating development on the generally disturbed areas Reclamation parcel.

6.4.6.1 Description of Alternative

The No Development on Panhandle Parcel – 656 Units Alternative would provide a total of 656 residential dwelling units consisting entirely of High Density units, and located only on the Reclamation parcel. No development would occur on the Panhandle parcel, with the exception of some limited grading and construction of utilities to support the development. Figure 6-5 provides the conceptual land use plan for the No Development on Panhandle Parcel – 656 Units Alternative. Table 6-5 provides a statistical summary, with a more detailed land use summary provided on Figure 6-5.

Table 6-5. No Development on Panhandle Parcel – 656 Units Alternative Statistical Summary

Land Use Type	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units
<i>Residential</i>		
Multi Family	35.3	656
<i>Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>35.3</i>	<i>656</i>
<i>Non-Residential</i>		
Open Space	104.0	N/A
Public Use	7.1	N/A
Public Roads	9.6	N/A
<i>Non-Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>120.7</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Aesthetics. Implementation of this alternative would avoid the significant visual impact associated with the proposed project as it relates to modification of the view from the Marron-Hayes Adobe. As discussed in Section 5.1, the character-defining features of Marron-Hayes Adobe building include its historic setting and viewshed from the full-length recessed *corredor*, qualities that contribute to its NRHP and CRHR eligibility. The *corredor* functioned as primary circulation space as well as living space, and included a scenic view overlooking the Buena Vista Creek and open hillsides located to the south. Under this alternative, no residential development would be allowed on the Panhandle parcel, avoiding the aesthetic impact associated with the proposed project.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant agriculture and forestry resources impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Air Quality. This alternative would reduce the short-term air quality impact associated with daily construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Under this alternative, no development would occur on the Panhandle parcel, with the exception of limited grading and construction associated with the placement of utilities. Because the overall area of disturbance would be less than the proposed project, daily fugitive dust emissions during grading, heavy equipment use, and from construction workers commuting to and from the project site would be less. Development of a smaller area, generally confined to the Reclamation parcel, would also reduce the required construction vehicle fleet mix, therefore, daily emissions thresholds for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} would be less. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures as outlined in Section 5.3 would be required in order to reduce the daily construction emissions to a level less than significant.

No significant air quality impacts associated with the operation of the proposed project have been identified. Therefore, this alternative would not avoid, or reduce, a significant operational air quality impact.

Biological Resources. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the biological impacts associated with the proposed project. As compared to the proposed project, this alternative would essentially eliminate any disturbance on the Panhandle parcel, with the exception of some disturbance associated with the placement of utilities. The total amount of open space would be increased by 16.1 acres (87.9 acres of open space proposed under the Master Plan, 104.0 acres under this alternative). The 56-acre Panhandle parcel would become open space, creating approximately 75.5 acres of contiguous open space within PA OS-1 along the project's southern boundary. This alternative would result in decreased impacts to a variety of sensitive habitats located on the Panhandle parcel including Diegan coastal sage scrub (DCSS), baccharis scrub, southern riparian woodland, southern willow scrub as well as non-native grassland, although, as with the proposed project, mitigation would be required. Impacts to the two jurisdictional drainages located in the Panhandle parcel would be avoided. The open space PA for Buena Vista Creek as it traverses through the site would be the same as the proposed project. This alternative would expand the HMP Hardline (i.e., increase the open space) on the Panhandle parcel.

Cultural Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar impact as the proposed project to cultural resources site SDI-5651, Locus 1 due to the need to construct utility infrastructure. Locus 1 is recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR and considered a cultural resource under CEQA and the City's cultural resource guidelines. It is highly probable that relatively undisturbed deposits remain at Locus 1. Locus 1 will be preserved in open space under the proposed project, and Locus 1 would also be preserved under this alternative. However, as with the proposed project, construction and maintenance activities associated with supporting utilities for the project could inadvertently impact this resource, if not properly shielded and mitigation is required as outlined in Section 5.5.

Implementation of this alternative would reduce the potential impact with respect to the potential to impact previously unearthed resources. Because this alternative would have a reduced development footprint/area of disturbance as compared to the proposed project (i.e., there would be only minimal grading within the Panhandle parcel); there would be a reduced potential for project grading activities to encountered previously unearthed cultural resources. However, mitigation that addresses the potential for encountering buried resources would be similar for this alternative as the proposed project, as outlined in Section 5.5.

Under this alternative, PA OS-1 would be the same size as the proposed project in the area of El Salto Falls.

This alternative would reduce the potentially significant paleontological resource impacts associated with grading/excavation in previously undisturbed areas of the project site. Specifically, Quaternary terrace deposits (moderate sensitivity) are located on the Panhandle parcel, which would not be developed under this alternative. As with the project, this alternative would still require the implementation of mitigation measures associated with these potential impacts as identified in Section 5.5 which would be required for grading in previously undisturbed areas of the Reclamation parcel.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

PA	LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN DENSITY RANGE	GROSS ACRES	NET ACRES	DENSITY	MAX. UNITS
RESIDENTIAL							
R-1	Apartments *	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	7.1	6.0	23.0	138
R-2	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	11.1	9.4	23.0	216
R-3	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	6.7	5.7	21.9	125
R-4	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	10.4	8.8	20.0	177
RESIDENTIAL SUB-TOTALS				35.3	29.9	--	656
PUBLIC USE							
P-1	Community Facilities	(CF) Community Facility	--	0.9	0.9	--	--
P-2	Community Facility Site	(CF) Community Facility	--	2.1	1.2	--	--
P-3	Community Recreation Area	(OS) Open Space	--	1.3	1.0	--	--
P-4	Trail, View Area, Water Quality Basin	(OS) Open Space	--	2.8	2.8	--	--
PUBLIC USE SUB-TOTALS				7.1	5.9	--	--
OPEN SPACE							
OS-1	Southerly Open Space Corridor Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	75.5	--	--	--
OS-2	Wetland Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	20.1	--	--	--
OS-3	Buena Vista Creek and Buffer	(OS) Open Space	--	8.4	--	--	--
OPEN SPACE SUB-TOTALS				104.0	--	--	--
Public Roads				9.6	9.6	--	--
PROJECT TOTALS				156.0	45.4	--	656

* Includes affordable and potential market rate units.

- Existing HMP Hardline
- New HMP Hardline per this Alternative
- Brush Management per HMP Hardline Map

NOTE: Some off-site grading & improvements on panhandle is required to accommodate the construction and maintenance of utilities.



No Development on Panhandle Parcel - 656 units

FIGURE 6-5

Geology and Soils. This alternative would reduce the level of disturbance on the project site, resulting in a reduced geology and soils impact as compared to the proposed project. While the number of dwelling units would be the same as the proposed project, the overall development footprint would be confined to the Reclamation parcel only, therefore, less grading, topographical alteration and soils disturbance would occur. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.6 Geology and Soils of this EIR would be required under this alternative.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant greenhouse gas emissions/global climate change impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impact as the proposed project. Grading activities under this alternative would include grading south of Haymar Drive and would result in the need for removal and disposal of 1,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials of this EIR would be required under this alternative. .

Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the potential short-term water quality impacts associated with grading and construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Because there would be less disturbance and overall grading under this alternative, there would be less potential for sedimentation to occur to Buena Vista Creek during a rainfall event. Potential water quality impacts identified for the project are associated predominantly with short-term construction activities including grading, excavation, and construction of drainage facilities. Specifically, these potential impacts include erosion/sedimentation, discharge of construction-related hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, etc.), and erosion/sedimentation and/or contaminant discharge from the disposal of extracted groundwater (if required). As with the proposed project, implementation of construction BMPs (as outlined in the SWPPP) during construction would reduce potential impacts to water quality to a level less than significant. Although no significant operational impacts have been identified associated with the proposed project, this alternative would reduce the potential for pollutants to be generated from residential developments, streets, and parking lots.

Land Use and Planning. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant land use and planning impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Noise. This alternative would result in a similar noise impact as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the future noise levels are expected to be at or below 60 dBA CNEL and no noise mitigation would be required to comply with the City of Carlsbad Noise standards based on currently proposed uses. However, mitigation is proposed that would require a site specific noise study to be prepared for each residential Lot based upon the final site design (i.e., site plan for each residential project within the Master Plan), building orientation, and pad elevations to ensure compliance with the City's exterior noise thresholds.

In addition, the second level building facades are anticipated to be above 60 dBA CNEL at Lots 1 (PA R-1), 2 (PA R-2), 3 (PA R-3), and 4 (PD R-4). As with the proposed project, this alternative would require mitigation in the form of preparing a final interior noise assessment based on final building design (i.e., architectural and building plans), and to identify the interior noise requirements based upon architectural and building plans.

Population and Housing. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant population and housing impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Public Services. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with public services as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

Transportation and Traffic. This alternative would result in a similar transportation and traffic impact as the proposed project as the ADTs generated by this alternative would be the same as the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with utilities and service systems as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

6.4.6.2 Conclusion – No Development on the Panhandle Parcel – 656 Units Alternative

Under this alternative, impacts to aesthetics would be avoided. Additionally, this alternative would reduce impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, and hydrology and water quality. Impacts to noise and transportation would be similar to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the following objectives of the project:

- (2) Provide a high density and medium-high density community in compliance with the policies of the Housing Element of the Carlsbad General Plan.
- (12) Provide an economically-viable development program for the property.
- (14) Provide for a variety of housing choices in order to accommodate the housing needs of a range of economic levels and age groups, to promote social diversity and to support an economically viable development program.
- (16) Provide architectural and landscape Guidelines applicable to an approximate mix of housing types which meet the City's goals for establishing a sustainable community that is marketable within the evolving economic profile of the surrounding community and the City of Carlsbad as a whole.
- (18) Ensure sufficient developable acreage in different residential densities to provide varied housing types for households in all economic segments.
- (19) Provide a plan that recognizes the development potential of the entire site as contemplated in the current adopted General Plan and Habitat Management Plan.
- (20) Obtain approval of a development plan with sufficient variety of product types to overcome the economic impact of the City of Carlsbad's infrastructure construction and public safety requirements, which severely constrain infrastructure phasing on the property.

6.4.7 No Development on Panhandle Parcel – 506 Units

The purpose of this alternative is to reduce and/or avoid environmental impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, grading, and water quality, and cultural resources, by eliminating proposed development from the Panhandle parcel, and concentrating development on the generally disturbed areas Reclamation parcel. This alternative also reduces the total number of dwelling units to 506.

6.4.7.1 Description of Alternative

The No Development on Panhandle Parcel – 506 Units Alternative would provide a total of 506 residential dwelling units consisting of 306 High Density units and 200 Medium High Density units. Development would be located only on the Reclamation parcel. No development would occur on the Panhandle parcel, with the exception of some limited grading and construction of utilities to support the development. Figure 6-6 provides the conceptual land use plan for the No Development on Panhandle Parcel – 306 Units alternative. Table 6-6 provides a statistical summary, with a more detailed land use summary provided on Figure 6-6.

Table 6-6. No Development on Panhandle Parcel – 506 Units Alternative Statistical Summary

Land Use Type	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units
<i>Residential</i>		
Multi Family – High Density	18.2	306
Multi Family – Medium High Density	17.1	200
<i>Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>35.3</i>	<i>506</i>
<i>Non-Residential</i>		
Open Space	104.0	N/A
Public Use	7.1	N/A
Public Roads	9.6	N/A
<i>Non-Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>120.7</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Aesthetics. Implementation of this alternative would avoid the significant visual impact associated with the proposed project as it relates to modification of the view from the Marron-Hayes Adobe. As discussed in Section 5.1, the character-defining features of Marron-Hayes Adobe building include its historic setting and viewshed from the full-length recessed *corredor*, qualities that contribute to its NRHP and CRHR eligibility. The *corredor* functioned as primary circulation space as well as living space, and included a scenic view overlooking the Buena Vista Creek and open hillsides located to the south. Under this alternative, no residential development would be allowed on the Panhandle parcel, avoiding the aesthetic impact associated with the proposed project.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant agriculture and forestry resources impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Air Quality. This alternative would reduce the short-term air quality impact associated with daily construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Under this alternative, no development would occur on the Panhandle parcel, with the exception of limited grading and construction associated with the placement of utilities. Because the overall area of disturbance would be less than the proposed project, daily fugitive dust emissions during grading, heavy equipment use, and from construction workers commuting to and from the project site would be less. Development of a smaller area, generally confined to the previously graded Reclamation parcel, would also reduce the required construction vehicle fleet mix, therefore, daily emissions thresholds for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} would be less. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures as outlined in Section 5.3 would be required in order to reduce the daily construction emissions to a level less than significant.

No significant air quality impacts associated with the operation of the proposed project have been identified. Therefore, this alternative would not avoid, or reduce, a significant operational air quality impact.

Biological Resources. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the biological impacts associated with the proposed project. As compared to the proposed project, this alternative would essentially eliminate any disturbance on the Panhandle parcel, with the exception of some disturbance associated with the placement of utilities. The total amount of open space would be increased by 16.1 acres (87.9 acres of open space proposed under the Master Plan, 104.0 acres under this alternative). The 56-acre Panhandle parcel would become open space, creating approximately 75.5 acres of contiguous open space within PA OS-1 along the project's southern boundary. This alternative would result in decreased impacts to a variety of sensitive habitats located on the Panhandle parcel including DCSS, baccharis scrub, southern riparian woodland, southern willow scrub as well as non-native grassland. Impacts to the two jurisdictional drainages located in the Panhandle parcel would be avoided. The open space PA for Buena Vista Creek as it traverses through the site would be the same as the proposed project. This alternative would expand the HMP Hardline (i.e., increase the open space) on the Panhandle parcel.

Cultural Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar impact as the proposed project to cultural resources site SDI-5651, Locus 1 due to the need to construct utility infrastructure. Locus 1 is recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR and considered a cultural resource under CEQA and the City's cultural resource guidelines. It is highly probable that relatively undisturbed deposits remain at Locus 1. Locus 1 will be preserved in open space under the proposed project, and it can be assumed that Locus 1 would also be preserved under this alternative. However, as with the proposed project, construction and maintenance activities associated with supporting utilities for the project could inadvertently impact this resource, if not properly shielded and mitigation is required as outlined in Section 5.5.




Implementation of this alternative would reduce the potential impact with respect to the potential to impact previously unearthed resources. Because this alternative would have a reduced development footprint/area of disturbance as compared to the proposed project (i.e., there would be only minimal grading within the Panhandle parcel); there would be a reduced potential for project grading activities to encountered previously unearthed cultural resources. However, mitigation that addresses the potential for encountering buried resources would be similar for this alternative as the proposed project, as outlined in Section 5.5.

Under this alternative, PA OS-1 would be the same size as the proposed project in the area of El Salto Falls.

This alternative would reduce the potentially significant paleontological resource impacts associated with grading/excavation in previously undisturbed areas of the project site. Specifically, Quaternary terrace deposits (moderate sensitivity) are located on the Panhandle parcel, which would not be developed under this alternative. As with the project, this alternative would still require the implementation of mitigation measures associated with these potential impacts as identified in Section 5.5 which would be required for grading in previously undisturbed areas of the Reclamation parcel.

PA	LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN DENSITY RANGE	GROSS ACRES	NET ACRES	DENSITY	MAX. UNITS
RESIDENTIAL							
R-1	Apartments *	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	7.1	5.9	20.0	118
R-2	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	11.1	9.4	20.0	188
R-3	Planned Development	(RMH) Medium-High Density	8-15 du/ac	6.7	5.7	13.8	79
R-4	Planned Development	(RMH) Medium-High Density	8-15 du/ac	10.4	8.8	13.8	121
RESIDENTIAL SUB-TOTALS				35.3	29.9	--	506
PUBLIC USE							
P-1	Community Facilities	(CF) Community Facility	--	0.9	0.9	--	--
P-2	Community Facility Site	(CF) Community Facility	--	2.1	1.2	--	--
P-3	Community Recreation Area	(OS) Open Space	--	1.3	1.0	--	--
P-4	Trail, View Area, Water Quality Basin	(OS) Open Space	--	2.8	2.8	--	--
PUBLIC USE SUB-TOTALS				7.1	5.9	--	--
OPEN SPACE							
OS-1	Southerly Open Space Corridor Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	75.5	--	--	--
OS-2	Wetland Preserve	(OS) Open Space	--	20.1	--	--	--
OS-3	Buena Vista Creek and Buffer	(OS) Open Space	--	8.4	--	--	--
OPEN SPACE SUB-TOTALS				104.0	--	--	--
Public Roads				9.6	9.6	--	--
PROJECT TOTALS				156.0	45.4	--	506

* Includes affordable and potential market rate units.

-  Existing HMP Hardline
-  New HMP Hardline per this Alternative
-  Brush Management per HMP Hardline Map

NOTE: Some off-site grading & improvements on panhandle is required to accommodate the construction and maintenance of utilities.



No Development on Panhandle Parcel - 506 units

FIGURE 6-6

Geology and Soils. This alternative would reduce the level of disturbance on the project site, resulting in a reduced geology and soils impact as compared to the proposed project. The number of dwelling units would be less the proposed project, and the overall development footprint would be confined to the Reclamation parcel only, therefore, less grading, topographical alteration and soils disturbance would occur. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.6 Geology and Soils of this EIR would be required under this alternative.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant greenhouse gas emissions/global climate change impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. This alternative would result in similar hazards and hazardous materials impact as the proposed project. Grading activities under this alternative would include grading south of Haymar Drive and would result in the need for removal and disposal of 1,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials of this EIR would be required under this alternative. .

Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the potential short-term water quality impacts associated with grading and construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Because there would be less disturbance and overall grading under this alternative, there would be less potential for sedimentation to occur to Buena Vista Creek during a rainfall event. Potential water quality impacts identified for the project are associated predominantly with short-term construction activities including grading, excavation, and construction of drainage facilities. Specifically, these potential impacts include erosion/sedimentation, discharge of construction-related hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, etc.), and erosion/sedimentation and/or contaminant discharge from the disposal of extracted groundwater (if required). As with the proposed project, implementation of construction BMPs (as outlined in the SWPPP) during construction would reduce potential impacts to water quality to a level less than significant. Although no significant operational impacts have been identified associated with the proposed project, this alternative would reduce the potential for pollutants to be generated from residential developments, streets, and parking lots.

Land Use and Planning. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant land use and planning impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified. However, this alternative would not provide any moderate income affordable units.

Noise. This alternative would result in a similar noise impact as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the future noise levels are expected to be at or below 60 dBA CNEL and no noise mitigation would be required to comply with the City of Carlsbad Noise standards based on currently proposed uses. However, mitigation is proposed that would require a site specific noise study to be prepared for each residential Lot based upon the final site design (i.e., site plan for each residential project within the Master Plan), building orientation, and pad elevations to ensure compliance with the City's exterior noise thresholds.

In addition, the second level building facades are anticipated to be above 60 dBA CNEL at Lots 1 (PA R-1), 2 (PA R-2), 3 (PA R-3), and 4 (PD R-4). As with the proposed project, this alternative would require mitigation in the form of preparing a final interior noise assessment based on final building design (i.e., architectural and building plans), and to identify the interior noise requirements based upon architectural and building plans.

Population and Housing. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant population and housing impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Public Services. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with public services as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

Transportation and Traffic. This alternative would result in a similar transportation and traffic impact as the proposed project. Although less traffic would be generated under this alternative, it would not be reduced to a level as to avoid the significant, direct impacts associated with the proposed project.

Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with utilities and service systems as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

6.4.7.2 Conclusion – No Development on the Panhandle Parcel – 506 Units Alternative

Under this alternative, impacts to aesthetics would be avoided, and impacts to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality would be reduced. Impacts to noise and traffic would be similar to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the following objectives of the project:

- (2) Provide a high density and medium-high density community in compliance with the policies of the Housing Element of the Carlsbad General Plan.
- (12) Provide an economically-viable development program for the property.
- (18) Ensure sufficient developable acreage in different residential densities to provide varied housing types for households in all economic segments.
- (19) Provide a plan that recognizes the development potential of the entire site as contemplated in the current adopted General Plan and Habitat Management Plan.
- (20) Obtain approval of a development plan with sufficient variety of product types to overcome the economic impact of the City of Carlsbad's infrastructure construction and public safety requirements, which severely constrain infrastructure phasing on the property.

6.4.8 No Direct Traffic Impact Alternative




The purpose of this alternative is to avoid the significant, and unmitigable, direct traffic impact associated with the proposed project. For Existing Plus Project and Near Term Plus Project, the ADT would have to be 1,960± ADT or less for no direct impacts.

6.4.8.1 Description of Alternative

The No Direct Traffic Impact Alternative would provide a total of 250 residential dwelling units consisting of 217 High Density units and 33 Medium Density units. The development footprint would be limited to only the previously disturbed areas of the Reclamation parcel. Figure 6-7 provides the conceptual land use plan for the No Direct Traffic Impact Alternative. Table 6-7 provides a statistical summary, with a more detailed summary provided on Figure 6-7.

PA	LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN LAND USE	GENERAL PLAN DENSITY RANGE	GROSS ACRES	NET ACRES	DENSITY	MAX. UNITS
RESIDENTIAL							
R-1	Apartments *	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	3.3	3.0	20.0	60
R-2	Planned Development	(RH) High Density	15-23 du/ac	8.1	7.8	20.1	157
R-3	Planned Development	(RLM) Low-Medium Density	0-4 du/ac	7.0	6.0	4.0	24
R-4	Planned Development	(RLM) Low-Medium Density	0-4 du/ac	2.4	2.2	4.0	9
RESIDENTIAL SUB-TOTALS				20.8	19.0	--	250
PUBLIC USE							
P-1	Community Facilities	(CF) Community Facility	--	0.9	0.9	--	--
P-2	Community Facility Site	(CF) Community Facility	--	2.1	1.2	--	--
P-3	Community Recreation Area	(OS) Open Space	--	1.4	1.4	--	--
P-4	Trail, View Area, Water Quality Basin	(OS) Open Space	--	1.5	1.5	--	--
PUBLIC USE SUB-TOTALS				5.9	5.0	--	--
OPEN SPACE							
OS-1	Open Space	(OS) Open Space	--	108.7	--	--	--
OS-2	Open Space	(OS) Open Space	--	3.5	--	--	--
OS-3	Open Space	(OS) Open Space	--	3.4	--	--	--
OS-4	Open Space	(OS) Open Space	--	7.8	--	--	--
OPEN SPACE SUB-TOTALS				123.4	--	--	--
Public Roads				--	5.9	--	--
PROJECT TOTALS				156.0	29.9	--	250

* Includes affordable and potential market rate units.

-  Existing HMP Hardline
-  New HMP Hardline per this Alternative
-  Brush Management per HMP Hardline Map

NOTE: Some off-site grading & improvements on panhandle is required to accommodate the construction and maintenance of utilities.



No Direct Traffic Impact Alternative
FIGURE 6-7

Table 6-7. No Direct Traffic Impact Alternative Statistical Summary

Land Use Type	Gross Acres	Dwelling Units
<i>Residential</i>		
Multi Family	11.4	250
<i>Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>20.8</i>	<i>250</i>
Non-Residential		
Open Space	123.4	N/A
Public Use	5.9	N/A
Public Roads	5.9	N/A
<i>Non-Residential Subtotals</i>	<i>156.0</i>	<i>N/A</i>

Aesthetics. Implementation of this alternative would avoid the significant visual impact associated with the proposed project as it relates to modification of the view from the Marron-Hayes Adobe. Under this alternative, residential development would not occur on the Panhandle parcel; therefore, the significant impact associated with the modification of the view from the Marron-Hayes Adobe would be avoided.

Agriculture and Forestry Resources. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant agriculture and forestry resources impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Air Quality. This alternative would reduce the short-term air quality impact to the proposed project associated with daily construction activities. This alternative would limit development to only those portions of the project site that have been previously graded associated with the mining and reclamation activities. Because the overall area of disturbance would be less than the proposed project, and the amount of grading would be less, daily fugitive dust emissions during grading, heavy equipment usage, and from construction workers commuting to and from the project site would be less. Mitigation measures as outlined in Section 5.3 would still be required in order to reduce the daily emissions to a level less than significant.

No significant air quality impacts associated with the operation of the proposed project have been identified. Therefore, this alternative would not avoid, or reduce, a significant operational air quality impact.

Biological Resources. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the impact to biological resources as compared to the proposed project, with the majority of the impacts being avoided completely. Under this alternative, the development footprint would be limited to only those portions of the project site that have been previously disturbed except for those areas required to construct the Street “B” connection to Haymar Drive. Therefore, a majority of the biological impacts would be avoided. Impacts to all jurisdictional areas would be avoided. There would be some disturbance in the OS-1 planning area associated with the construction of utility infrastructure to serve the project site. The open space PA for Buena Vista Creek as it traverses through the site would be the same as the proposed project. Under this alternative the HMP hard line would be increased as compared to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources. Implementation of this alternative would result in a similar impact as the proposed project to cultural resources site SDI-5651, Locus 1 due to the need to construct utility infrastructure in this area to serve the project. Locus 1 is recommended eligible for listing in the CRHR and considered a

cultural resource under CEQA and the City's cultural resource guidelines. It is highly probable that relatively undisturbed deposits remain at Locus 1. Locus 1 will be preserved in open space under the proposed project, and it can be assumed that Locus 1 would also be preserved under this alternative. However, as with the proposed project, construction and maintenance activities associated with supporting utilities for the project could inadvertently impact this resource, if not properly shielded and mitigation is required as outlined in Section 5.5.

Implementation of this alternative would reduce the impact with respect to the potential to impact previously unearthed resources, as the development would be confined to the previously graded areas, and little additional disturbance would occur outside of these areas for utility construction. As with the proposed project, damage to a previously unknown resource would be considered a significant impact and mitigation for this alternative would be required as outlined in Section 5.5.

The El Salto Falls has been identified by the San Luis Rey Band and the Luiseño tribe as a sacred site, used for tribal religious ceremonies and important in their cultural history. The development of a Falls Management Plan was a requirement of the City of Oceanside's Reclamation Plan approval, which was approved by the City of Oceanside in June 2010. The Falls Management Plan applies to the area within 200 feet of the El Salto Falls. Under this alternative, PA OS-1 would be the same size as the proposed project in the area of El Salto Falls.

This alternative would also reduce the potential paleontological resource impacts associated with grading/excavation in previously undisturbed areas of the Quaternary terrace deposits (moderate sensitivity) and the Tertiary Santiago Formation (high sensitivity). Under this alternative, because little new disturbance would occur outside of previously graded areas, the potential to encounter paleontological resources would be less. This alternative would require the implementation of mitigation measures associated with these potential impacts as identified in Section 5.5 for any disturbance outside of previously graded areas, which would be limited to the utility construction necessary to serve the project.

Geology and Soils. This alternative would reduce the geology and soils impact associated with implementation of the proposed project. Both the number of dwelling units and the overall development footprint would be less than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, implementation of mitigation as identified in Section 5.6 Geology and Soils of this EIR would be required under this alternative, however, substantially less earthwork would be required to implement the alternative.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant greenhouse gas emissions/global climate change impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the hazards and hazardous materials impact associated with removal of 1,000 cubic yards of petroleum contaminated soil as this alternative would avoid grading activities in the area south of Haymar Drive containing the contaminated soil. Therefore, compared to the project, the impact would be avoided. .

Hydrology and Water Quality. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the potential short-term water quality impacts associated with grading and construction activities as compared to the proposed project. Because the area of disturbance and grading would be less than the proposed project, with relatively little new disturbance in currently undisturbed areas, there would be significantly less potential for sedimentation to occur to Buena Vista Creek during a rainfall event. Potential water quality impacts

identified for the project are associated predominantly with short-term construction activities including grading, excavation, and construction of drainage facilities. Specifically, these potential impacts include erosion/sedimentation, discharge of construction-related hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, etc.), and erosion/sedimentation and/or contaminant discharge from the disposal of extracted groundwater (if required). As with the proposed project, implementation of construction BMPs (as outlined in the SWPPP) during construction would reduce potential impacts to water quality to a level less than significant. Although no significant operational impacts have been identified associated with the proposed project, this alternative would result in less potential for pollutants to be generated from residential developments, streets, and parking lots as the overall development footprint would be less than the project. As with the proposed project, implementation of BMPs and other water quality treatment features would be required in order to ensure no long-term water quality impact would occur.

Land Use and Planning. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant land use and planning impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified. However, this alternative would not provide the quantity and diversity of residential units as stipulated in the City's current Housing Element, necessitating the construction of residential units elsewhere. This alternative would not be consistent with SANDAG regional smart growth plans.

Noise. This alternative would result in a similar noise impact as the proposed project. As with the proposed project, the future noise levels are expected to be at or below 60 dBA CNEL and no noise mitigation would be required to comply with the City of Carlsbad Noise standards based on currently proposed uses. However, mitigation is proposed that would require a site specific noise study to be prepared for each residential Lot based upon the final site design (i.e., site plan for each residential project within the Master Plan), building orientation, and pad elevations to ensure compliance with the City's exterior noise thresholds.

In addition, the second level building facades are anticipated to be above 60 dBA CNEL at Lots 1 (PA R-1), 2 (PA R-2), 3 (PA R-3), and 4 (PD R-4). As with the proposed project, this alternative would require mitigation in the form of preparing a final interior noise assessment based on final building design (i.e., architectural and building plans), and to identify the interior noise requirements based upon architectural and building plans.

Population and Housing. Implementation of this alternative would not reduce, or avoid, any significant population and housing impact associated with the proposed project as no significant impact has been identified.

Public Services. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with public services as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

Transportation and Traffic. This alternative would avoid the significant, direct and unmitigable traffic impact associated with the proposed project as it would generate less than 1,960 ADTs.

Utilities and Service Systems. This alternative would not avoid or reduce any significant impact associated with utilities and service systems as no significant impact associated with the proposed project has been identified.

6.4.8.2 Conclusion – No Direct Traffic Impact Alternative

This alternative would avoid the significant direct traffic impacts associated with the proposed project and would also avoid the aesthetic impact associated with the proposed project. This alternative would reduce impacts in all other resource categories, with the exception of noise, in which the impact would be similar to the proposed project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the following objectives of the project:

- (1) Provide land uses that are compatible and complementary with the existing surrounding and adjacent land uses and facilities in an effort to sustain the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) “Smart Growth” principles for the Quarry Creek area. Establish sufficient land use intensity on the site to support the “Community Center” designation on the Smart Growth Concept Map.
- (2) Provide a high density and medium-high density community in compliance with the policies of the Housing Element of the Carlsbad General Plan.
- (4) Develop a sustainable community by focusing the land use design parameters on environmental, cultural, social and economic sustainability. Provide a plan that is strongly influenced by recognition of the balance between human interaction (development of urban uses) and natural systems (environmental conservation), in order to meet the needs of current and future generations, and to respect the history of past generations who have lived on the property.
- (11) Implement the applicable portions of the City of Carlsbad General Plan and Zoning Code; and the Zone 25 Local Facilities Management Plan, as adopted by the concurrent application.
- (12) Provide an economically-viable development program for the property.
- (14) Provide for a variety of housing choices in order to accommodate the housing needs of a range of economic levels and age groups, to promote social diversity and to support an economically viable development program.
- (16) Provide architectural and landscape Guidelines applicable to an appropriate mix of housing types which meet the City’s goals for establishing a sustainable community that is marketable within the evolving economic profile of the surrounding community and the City of Carlsbad as a whole.
- (18) Ensure sufficient developable acreage in different residential densities to provide varied housing types for households in all economic segments.
- (19) Provide a plan that recognizes the development potential of the entire site as contemplated in the current adopted General Plan and Habitat Management Plan.
- (20) Obtain approval of a development plan with sufficient variety of product types to overcome the economic impact of the City of Carlsbad’s infrastructure construction and public safety requirements, which severely constrain infrastructure phasing on the property.

6.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The No Direct Traffic Impact Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative to the proposed project as it would avoid the significant direct traffic impacts associated with the proposed project and would also avoid the aesthetic impact associated with the proposed project. This alternative would reduce impacts in all other resource categories, with the exception of noise, in which the impact would be similar to the proposed project.

Table 6-8. Comparison of Alternative Impacts to Proposed Project

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project (656 du)	6-1 No Project/ Existing General Plan (293 du)	6-2 No Project/ No Development (0 du)	6-3 Reduced Development Footprint (656 du)	6-4 Existing HMP Hardline/Circulation Element (788 du)	6-5 Special Use Area for Planning Area R-5 (656 du)	6-6 No Development on Panhandle Parcel (656 du)	6-7 No Development on Panhandle Parcel (506 du)	6-8 Traffic Impact Avoidance Alternative (250 du)
Aesthetics		Greater – (mitigation required)	Avoid	Avoid	Greater (mitigation required)	Avoid	Avoid	Avoid	Avoid
Agriculture and Forestry Resources		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Air Quality		Construction – Greater (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Avoid Operation – N/A	Construction – Reduce (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Greater (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Similar (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Reduce (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Reduce (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Reduce (mitigation required) Operation – N/A
Biological Resources		Greater (mitigation required)	Avoid	Reduce (mitigation required)	Greater (mitigation required)	Similar (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)
Cultural Resources		Greater (mitigation required)	Avoid	Reduce (mitigation required)	Greater (mitigation required)	Similar (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)
Geology and Soils		Greater (mitigation required)	Avoid	Reduce (mitigation required)	Greater (mitigation required)	Similar (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		N/A	Avoid	Construction – Similar (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Similar (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Similar (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Similar (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Construction – Similar (mitigation required) Operation – N/A	Avoid
Hydrology and Water Quality		Greater (mitigation required)	Avoid	Reduce (mitigation required)	Greater (mitigation required)	Similar (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)	Reduce (mitigation required)

6.0 Alternatives

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project (656 du)	6-1 No Project/ Existing General Plan (293 du)	6-2 No Project/ No Development (0 du)	6-3 Reduced Development Footprint (656 du)	6-4 Existing HMP Hardline/Circulation Element (788 du)	6-5 Special Use Area for Planning Area R-5 (656 du)	6-6 No Development on Panhandle Parcel (656 du)	6-7 No Development on Panhandle Parcel (506 du)	6-8 Traffic Impact Avoidance Alternative (250 du)
Land Use and Planning		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Noise		Similar (mitigation required)	Avoid	Similar (mitigation required)	Similar (mitigation required)	Similar (mitigation required)	Similar (mitigation required)	Similar (mitigation required)	Similar (mitigation required)
Population and Housing		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Public Services		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Transportation and Traffic		Similar (mitigation required/ unmitigated)	Avoid	Similar (mitigation required/ unmitigated))	Similar (mitigation required/ unmitigated))	Similar (mitigation required/ unmitigated))	Similar (mitigation required/ unmitigated))	Similar (mitigation required/ unmitigated))	Avoid
Utilities and Service Systems		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Source: HDR 2012.

Notes:

NA = No significant impact identified associated with the proposed project.

Avoid = Impacts under this alternative avoided as compared to impacts for the proposed project.

Greater = Impacts under this alternative greater as compared to impacts for the proposed project.

Reduced = Impacts under this alternative reduced as compared to impacts for the proposed project.

Similar = Impacts under this alternative similar to the impacts for the proposed project.

This page intentionally left blank.